

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-3 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is herein amended. No new matter has been presented.

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by the examiner in the telephonic interview on April 13, 2010. Claim 1 was discussed including the amendments to claim 1 as submitted herewith with this paper.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiners thorough consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on January 22, 2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 has been amended. Because the scope of claim 1, as amended, can be ascertained with reasonable certainty when read in light of the specification, applicants submit that claim 2

particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Accordingly, applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Shimogama et al.** (United States Patent No. 6,294,887).

Applicant herein amend claim 1 to further distinguish over the Shimogama reference. The support for this amendment may be found on page 16 of the present specification as follows:

“[w]hen the release selection contact 25 is closed by the worker's operation, the lamp 34 connected thereto lights. The lamp 34 performs brake release indication, and indicates that the brakes of the automatic machine subject to brake releasing are ready to be released. In a state where the release selection contact 25 is closed by the worker's operation, when the first release contact 26, for example, is closed, a brake releasing current flows from the releasing brake power supply unit 24 to the release selection contact 25, the first release contact 26, the rectifier 27, and the first brake 14, such that the first brake 14 is released. Similarly, when the second release contact 28, the third release contact 30, and the fourth release contact 32 are closed, the second brake 17, the third brake 20, and the fourth brake 23 are released, respectively.”

It is respectfully submitted that Shimogama does not disclose the recitation in claim 1. More specifically, Shimogama, in Fig. 6 and the description related thereto, teaches the motor-brake power supply circuit 3 that supplies voltage to the brake-coils 4 when the motor-brake release switch contact 3a closes (col. 1, lines 27 to 33), and the indicator power supply circuit 6 that supplies voltage to the indicator section 5 when the switch contact 6a closes (col. 1, lines 34 to 44) are included. These two contacts synchronously operate (col. 1, line 18). The dash line between the contact 3a and the contact 6a in Fig. 6 is indicative of the synchronous operation of the switch. By way of this, the operator knows that the motor brake is released (col. 1, lines 45 to 47). The release of the motor brake and the indication of the indicator section 5 are simultaneously performed. However, the indicator section 5 does not indicate that it is ready to release the brake.

In contrast, in the claimed invention, the release selection contact (first switch) is configured to close by a worker's operation to turn on the brake release indication unit to indicate that the brake is ready to be released by the brake releasing unit, and the release contact (second switch) is configured to close so that a brake releasing current flowing from a power supply unit to the release selection contact flows to the release contact to release the brake.

Therefore, when brakes are released by a worker's operation, the subject automatic machines are identified by way of the lamp lights being ON so as to avoid an erroneous selection of automatic machines by the worker's mistake. Particularly, if there is a plurality of automatic

machines (Fig. 2), the subject machine can be easily identified thereby avoiding the erroneous selection whereby the brake is released on only the automatic machines whose lamp lights are ON state (lighted state).

Conclusion

The Claims have been shown to be allowable over the prior art. Applicants believe that this paper is responsive to each and every ground of rejection cited in the Office Action dated February 1, 2010, and respectfully request favorable action in this application. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/ROBERT Y RAHEJA/

Robert Y. Raheja
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,274
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

RYR/bam